

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAY 28 2008

U.S. Patent Application No.: 10/062,112

Art Unit: 1714

Page 6

**REMARKS**

Claim 18 has been rewritten in independent form, including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, and claim 19 has been amended to depend from claim 18. Claims 5, 9, 11, 13, and 23-25 have been amended to depend directly from allowable claim 51. Finally, claims 3, 15-17, and 29 have been cancelled without prejudice to filing the subject matter of these claims in one or more subsequent applications or to reintroduction in the present application. No new matter has been added. Thus, claims 5-7, 9, 11-13, 18-19, 23-25, 33, 49, and 51-54 are pending.

**Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 3, 5-9, 11-13, 15-17, 22-25, and 29 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zhu et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,251,175) in view of either Belmont et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,713,988) or Johnson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,478,863).

In paragraph 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner recites the rejection set forth in paragraph 8 of the Office Action mailed 12/14/06, along with the comments concerning Applicant's previous arguments filed 6/13/07 that were provided in paragraph 4 of the Office Action mailed September 7, 2007. The Examiner concludes that, given that Zhu et al. explicitly discloses the use of pigment, polymer such as styrene-acrylic acid, and salt such as calcium chloride with no disclosure that any combination of elements cannot be used together, given that Zhu et al. discloses the use of "any" pigment, and given that Belmont et al. and Johnson et al. each provide motivation to utilize pigment having anionic group in ink jet inks, and absent evidence to the contrary, there is a reasonable expectation of success when combining Zhu et al. with Belmont et al. or Johnson et al.

U.S. Patent Application No.: 10/062,112  
Art Unit: 1714  
Page 7

While Applicant continues to respectfully disagree, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, claims 3, 15-17, and 29 have been cancelled without prejudice to filing the subject matter of these claims in one or more subsequent applications or to reintroduction in the present application, making the rejection of these claims moot. Also, claims 8 and 22 had previously been cancelled (see Amendment and Response to Office Action dated June 13, 2007), making the rejection of these claims also moot. Finally, claims 5, 9, 11, 13, and 23-25 have been amended to depend directly from allowable claim 51. Thus, claims 5-7, 9, 11-13, and 23-25 depend directly or indirectly from an allowable claim and should therefore also be patentable over the combination of cited references.

Therefore, Applicant believes that claims 3, 5-9, 11-13, 15-17, 22-25, and 29 are patentable over Zhu et al. in view of either Belmont et al. or Johnson et al., and respectfully request that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

#### Allowable Subject Matter

In paragraph 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner states that claims 33, 49, and 51-54 are allowable over the "closest" prior art cited. Furthermore, in paragraph 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner states that claims 18-19 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicant is grateful for the allowable subject matter of claims 33, 49, and 51-54. In addition, claim 18 has been rewritten in independent form, including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, and claim 19 has been amended to depend directly from claim 18. Thus, Applicant believes claims 18 and 19 are also in condition for allowance.

U.S. Patent Application No.: 10/062,112

Art Unit: 1714


Page 8

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant believes that this application is in good and proper form for allowance, and the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephone conference would further expedite the prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

By:



Robert M. Amici

Reg. No. 52,554

Cabot Corporation

Law Department

157 Concord Road

Billerica, MA 01821-7001

Date: May 28, 2008

Attorney Docket No.: 00069CON